

Large- N_c Higher Order Weak Chiral Lagrangians for Nonleptonic and Radiative Kaon Decays*

HAI-YANG CHENG[†]

Institute of Physics, Academia Sinica, Taipei, Taiwan 11529, Republic of China

ABSTRACT

In pure chiral perturbation theory (ChPT) the couplings of higher order Lagrangian terms are running parameters and hence can be determined only empirically from various low-energy hadronic processes. While this scenario works well for strong interactions, it is unsatisfactory for nonleptonic and radiative nonleptonic weak interactions: It is impossible, from the outset, to determine all unknown higher-order chiral couplings by experiment; theory is tested only by certain chiral constraints rather than by its quantitative predictions. Based on a QCD-motivated model for p^4 strong chiral Lagrangian valid in the limit of large N_c , one can derive large- N_c fourth-order effective chiral Lagrangians for $\Delta S = 1$ nonleptonic weak interactions and radiative weak transitions. Applications to $K \rightarrow \pi\pi\pi$, $K \rightarrow \pi\gamma\gamma$, and $K \rightarrow \pi\pi\gamma$ are discussed.

* Invited talk presented at The Second German-Chinese Symposium on Medium Energy Physics, Sept. 7-11, 1992, Bochum, Germany.

[†] Bitnet address: phcheng@twnas886, hcheng@bnlcl1.

1. Introduction

There are at least two reasons that lead us to study seriously the structure of higher-order effective chiral Lagrangians for weak interactions. First, the $K(k) \rightarrow \pi(p_1)\pi(p_2)\pi(p_3)$ decay amplitude in the Dalitz plot is conventionally parametrized as

$$A(K \rightarrow 3\pi) = a + bY + c(Y^2 + X^2/3) + d(Y^2 - X^2/3), \quad (1.1)$$

where $Y = (s_3 - s_0)/m_\pi^2$, $X = (s_2 - s_1)/m_\pi^2$, $s_i = (k - p_i)^2$, $s_0 = (s_1 + s_2 + s_3)/3$. The experimental signal for the quadratic terms (*i.e.*, the parameters c and d) requires the inclusion of higher order weak Lagrangian terms containing four or more derivatives. Also, it is well known that current-algebra predictions for a and b are too small by 18% and 35% respectively. Second, the radiative kaon transition cannot be generated by the lowest-order chiral Lagrangian since Lorentz and gauge invariance requires at least two powers of momenta in the radiative decay amplitude. Therefore, it is necessary of higher order in chiral perturbation theory.

The couplings of higher-order chiral Lagrangians depend on the choice of the renormalization scale μ as divergences of chiral loops are absorbed by the counterterms which have the same structure as higher derivative chiral terms. Consequently, the unknown running parameters are not really fundamental coupling constants; also they cannot be fixed by the requirement of chiral symmetry alone. For strong interactions, Gasser and Leutwyler^[1] have empirically determined the coupling parameters at the mass scale $\mu = m_\eta$ from various low-energy hadronic processes in conjunction with the Zweig-rule argument.

Despite the fact that pure ChPT is phenomenologically successful when applied to low-energy strong-interaction physical processes, this approach is unsatisfactory for nonleptonic and radiative weak interactions. For example, in the chiral limit, there are seven independent p^4 Lagrangian $\mathcal{L}_W^{(4)}$ responsible for $\Delta S = 1$, $\Delta I = \frac{1}{2}$ weak transitions. Unfortunately, there is only one process, namely $K \rightarrow 3\pi$ decay, relevant for the determination of $\mathcal{L}_W^{(4)}$. Unlike the strong interaction, it is impossible from the outset to completely determine the structure of $\mathcal{L}_W^{(4)}$; only certain chiral constraint relations can be tested to check the validity of ChPT at the four-derivative level.^[2] That is, although pure ChPT is a rigorous theory, its ability of making predictions for phenomenological p^4 weak transitions and for radiative nonleptonic decays is rather limited. While the unknown coupling constants in ChPT in principle must

be determined by experiment so that its prediction is truly model independent, it is also important to appeal a dynamic model to help us understand the underlying physics if theory by itself does not lead to any significant quantitative predictions owing to present limitation from both experiment and theory.

A QCD-inspired model for nonanomalous four-derivative effective action for strong interactions does exist in the large N_c limit.^[3–6] It is obtained by coupling QCD to external meson and gauge fields. In the limit of N_c , chiral loops are suppressed and the effects of interest are due to the quark loops and the gluonic corrections arising from all planar diagrams without the internal quark loop. In the leading $1/N_c$ approach, coupling constants become renormalization scale independent and are (almost) uniquely determined.

One can then proceed to derive a large N_c effective Lagrangian for nonleptonic $\Delta S = 1$ weak interactions at order p^4 based on the following three ingredients^[7]: a rather simple structure of the effective weak Hamiltonian in the leading $1/N_c$ expansion, bosonization up to the subleading order, and factorization valid in the limit of large N_c . Confrontation with experiment for $K \rightarrow 3\pi$ decays reveals a good agreement for two of the measured parameters in the Dalitz expansion of $K \rightarrow 3\pi$ amplitudes.^[8] Based on the same approach, a derivation of non-anomalous and anomalous fourth-order chiral Lagrangians responsible for $\Delta S = 1$ radiative weak transitions is also straightforward.^[9]

2. Higher-order Chiral Lagrangians for Nonleptonic Weak Interactions

The lowest order chiral Lagrangian including explicit chiral-symmetry breaking for low-energy QCD is given by^[10]

$$\mathcal{L}_S^{(2)} = \frac{f_\pi^2}{8} \text{Tr}(\partial_\mu U \partial^\mu U^\dagger) + \frac{f_\pi^2}{8} \text{Tr}(MU^\dagger + UM^\dagger), \quad (2.1)$$

where $U = \exp(2i\frac{\phi}{f_\pi})$, $\phi = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\phi^a \lambda^a$, $\text{Tr}(\lambda^a \lambda^b) = 2\delta^{ab}$, $f_\pi = 132$ MeV, and M is a meson mass matrix with the non-vanishing matrix elements $M_{11} = M_{22} = m_\pi^2$, $M_{33} = 2m_K^2 - m_\pi^2$. It was established by Gasser and Leutwyler^[1] that in the chiral limit the most general expressions for the p^4 effective chiral Lagrangians including external vector V_μ and axial-vector A_μ gauge fields are

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_S^{(4)} = & L_1 [\text{Tr}(D^\mu U^\dagger D_\mu U)]^2 + L_2 [\text{Tr}(D_\mu U^\dagger D_\nu U)]^2 + L_3 \text{Tr}(D^\mu U^\dagger D_\mu U)^2 \\ & - iL_9 \text{Tr}(F_{\mu\nu}^R D^\mu U^\dagger D^\nu U + F_{\mu\nu}^L D^\mu U D^\nu U^\dagger) + L_{10} \text{Tr}(U^\dagger F_{\mu\nu}^R U F^{\mu\nu L}) \end{aligned} \quad (2.2)$$

with

$$\begin{aligned}
D_\mu U &= \partial_\mu U + A_\mu^L U - U A_\mu^R, \\
F_{\mu\nu}^{L,R} &= \partial_\mu A_\nu^{L,R} - \partial_\nu A_\mu^{L,R} + [A_\mu^{L,R}, A_\nu^{L,R}], \\
A_\mu^{L,R} &= V_\mu \pm A_\mu.
\end{aligned}
\tag{2.3}$$

Gasser and Leutwyler have empirically determined the parameters $L_1, \dots, L_{10}$ at the mass scale $\mu = m_\eta$ from various low energy hadronic processes in conjunction with the Zweig-rule argument.

In the limit of large N_c (N_c being the number of colors), the aforementioned chiral couplings are theoretically manageable at least to the zeroth order in α_s^2 . There exist several approaches for the computation of L_i .^[3–6] Here, we will only mention a formal one.^[3,5] First of all, the chiral-loop contribution is suppressed by at least a factor of $1/N_c$ relative to the quark loop at the same order of p^n in the leading $1/N_c$ expansion. Subsequently, the higher order couplings in the large N_c chiral perturbation theory are renormalization scale independent. Second, consider QCD coupled to external gauge fields. The integration of both quark and gluonic degrees of freedom yields two different categories of global chiral anomalies: proper (Bardeen) anomalies which contain the totally antisymmetric tensor $\epsilon_{\mu\nu\alpha\beta}$ and spurious anomalies which do not. Now the variation of the generating function under a local chiral transformation is governed by chiral anomalies. It is well known that the integration of topological anomalies gives the Wess-Zumino-Witten effective action. Likewise, the integration of nontopological anomalies yields an action for p^4 nonanomalous chiral Lagrangians. A consistent leading $1/N_c$ expansion requires one to include not only the contributions from the quark loops but also the gluonic effects arising from all planar diagrams without the internal quark loops. The gluonic corrections which have been neglected in previous publications were discussed in ref.[5]. In the chiral limit, the large- N_c chiral couplings valid to the leading order in gluonic corrections read^[3–6]

$$8L_1 = 4L_2 = L_9 = \frac{N_c}{48\pi^2}, \quad L_3 = L_{10} = \frac{N_c}{96\pi^2}(1 + \xi).
\tag{2.4}$$

It was shown in ref.[5] that to the first order in α_s only the couplings L_3 and L_{10} receive

gluonic modifications denoted by the parameter ξ in (2.4).[★]

Several remarks are in order. (i) The strong effective Lagrangian given by Eq.(2.4) should be viewed as a QCD-motivated model rather than a formal chiral Lagrangian derived from large- N_c QCD: It is obtained by coupling QCD to external gauge fields and considering its anomalous variation. (ii) Since the chiral parameters L_i in the leading $1/N_c$ expansion are scale-independent constants, one should in principle *not* compare Eq.(2.4) with the running couplings $L_i(\mu)$ determined from experiment. Nevertheless, empirically they are quite similar at the mass scale between 0.5 and 1 GeV.^[13]

It is known that the lowest-order chiral Lagrangian responsible for $\Delta S = 1$ and $\Delta I = \frac{1}{2}$ nonleptonic weak interactions reads

$$\mathcal{L}_W^{(2)} = -g_s \text{Tr}(\lambda_6 L_\mu L^\mu), \quad (2.5)$$

where $L_\mu \equiv (\partial_\mu U)U^\dagger$ is an $SU(3)_R$ singlet and $L_\mu^\dagger = -L_\mu$. The parameter g_s of the octet weak interaction is determined from the measured $K \rightarrow \pi\pi$ rates. In the chiral limit and in the absence of external gauge fields there are seven independent CP-even quartic-derivative weak Lagrangian terms^[14] which transform as $(8_L, 1_R)$ under chiral rotations:[†]

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_W^{(4)} = \frac{g_8}{f_\pi^2} & \left\{ h_1 \text{Tr}(\lambda_6 L_\mu L^\mu L_\nu L^\nu) + h_2 \text{Tr}(\lambda_6 L_\mu L_\nu L^\mu L^\nu) \right. \\ & + h_3 \text{Tr}(\lambda_6 L_\mu L_\nu L^\nu L^\mu) + h_4 \text{Tr}(\lambda_6 L_\mu L_\nu) \text{Tr}(L^\mu L^\nu) \\ & \left. + h_5 \text{Tr}(\lambda_6 \tilde{Y} \tilde{Y}) + h_6 \text{Tr}([\lambda_6, \tilde{Y}] L_\mu L^\mu) + h_7 \text{Tr}([\lambda_6, \tilde{Y}_{\mu\nu}] L^\mu L^\nu) \right\}, \end{aligned} \quad (2.6)$$

where $Y_{\mu\nu} = (\partial_\mu \partial_\nu U)U^\dagger$, $\tilde{Y}_{\mu\nu} = Y_{\mu\nu} - Y_{\mu\nu}^\dagger$, and $\tilde{Y} = g^{\mu\nu} \tilde{Y}_{\mu\nu}$. Under the CP transformation, $\tilde{Y}_{\mu\nu} \rightarrow -\tilde{Y}_{\mu\nu}^T$.

★ There exists an inconsistency for the chiral coupling L_{10}^r . The value of $L_{10}^r(\mu = m_\rho) = -(5.2 \pm 0.3) \times 10^{-3}$ often quoted in the literature is obtained from the experimental measurement of the axial-to-vector form factor ratio $f_A/f_V = 0.52 \pm 0.06$ (The updated value is 0.45 ± 0.06 ^[11]) in the radiative pion decay. On the other hand, it is extracted to be $-(2.9 \pm 0.8) \times 10^{-3}$ from the pion polarizability measured in the pion Compton scattering.^[12] While the former value is based on more precise experiments, the latter is favored by theory (though some experts may disagree on this point) for the reason that both L_3 and L_{10} receive the same amount of gluonic corrections^[5] and that the predicted $L_3 = 3.2 \times 10^{-3}$ (note that L_3 is μ -independent) to the zeroth order in α_s is already in good agreement with experiment. It is thus not clear to us what is the origin for the discrepancy. Fortunately, the coupling L_{10} is not relevant for our ensuing discussion. Therefore, we can safely put $\xi = 0$ for our later purposes.

† For the construction of the most general expressions of the counterterm Lagrangians relevant for the nonleptonic weak interactions, see ref.[15].

To determine the weak chiral parameters h_i in the $1/N_c$ expansion requires three ingredients: the $\Delta S = 1$ effective weak Hamiltonian at the quark level, bosonization and factorization, as we are going to elaborate on. The $\Delta S = 1$ effective nonleptonic Hamiltonian in the limit of large N_c has a rather simple structure^[16]

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{H}_{\text{eff}}^{\Delta S=1} &= \frac{G_F}{\sqrt{2}} \sin \theta_c \cos \theta_c \{c_8(Q_2 - Q_1) + c_{27}(Q_2 + 2Q_1)\}, \\ Q_1 &= (\bar{s}d)(\bar{u}u), \quad Q_2 = (\bar{s}u)(\bar{u}d),\end{aligned}\tag{2.7}$$

where $(\bar{q}_i q_j) \equiv \bar{q}_i \gamma_\mu (1 - \gamma_5) q_j$. The combination $(Q_2 - Q_1)$ is a $\Delta I = \frac{1}{2}$ four-quark operator which transforms as $(8_L, 1_R)$ under chiral rotation, while $(Q_2 + 2Q_1)$ is equivalent to a 27-plet $\Delta I = \frac{3}{2}$ operator in the large- N_c approximation.

Using Eqs.(2.2) and (2.4) one can determine the bosonization of the quark current $J_\mu^{ij} \equiv (\bar{q}^i q^j)$ to the next-to-leading order in chiral expansion. Writing $(J_\mu)_{ji} = (if_\pi^2/2)(\hat{L}_\mu)_{ij}$, the result is

$$\hat{L}_\mu = L_\mu + \frac{N_c}{24\pi^2 f_\pi^2} \left\{ (L_\nu L^\nu L_\mu + L_\mu L_\nu L^\nu) + [\tilde{Y}, L_\mu] + [L^\nu, \tilde{Y}_{\nu\mu}] \right\}.\tag{2.8}$$

Since factorization is valid in the large- N_c approximation, one may substitute (2.8) into (2.7) to obtain the quartic-derivative weak chiral couplings h_i ^[7]

$$h_1 = -\frac{1}{3}h_2 = \frac{1}{3}h_4 = h_6 = -h_7 = \frac{N_c}{24\pi^2}, \quad h_3 = h_5 = 0.\tag{2.9}$$

The effective weak chiral Lagrangians $\mathcal{L}_W^{(2)} + \mathcal{L}_W^{(4)}(1/N_c)$ have been tested successfully in the study of the nonleptonic $K \rightarrow \pi\pi\pi$ decay.^[8]

3. Electromagnetically Induced Anomalous and Non-anomalous Weak Chiral Lagrangians

The most general p^4 electromagnetically induced $\Delta S = 1$ non-anomalous weak Lagrangians with at most two external photon fields which satisfy the constraints of chiral and

CPS symmetry have the form

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{L}_{\text{non-anom}}^{\Delta S=1} = & i \left(\frac{2}{f_\pi^2} \right) g_8 e F^{\mu\nu} [\omega_1 \text{Tr}(\lambda_6 L_\mu L_\nu Q) + \omega_2 \text{Tr}(\lambda_6 L_\nu Q L_\mu)] \\ & + \omega_3 \left(\frac{2}{f_\pi^2} \right) g_8 e^2 F^{\mu\nu} F_{\mu\nu} \text{Tr}(\lambda_6 Q U Q U^\dagger),\end{aligned}\tag{3.1}$$

while the anomalous terms are $(\tilde{F}_{\mu\nu} \equiv \epsilon_{\mu\nu\alpha\beta} F^{\alpha\beta})^\dagger$

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{L}_{\text{anom}}^{\Delta S=1} = & i\omega_4 \left(\frac{2}{f_\pi^2} \right) g_8 e \tilde{F}^{\mu\nu} \text{Tr}(Q L_\mu) \text{Tr}(\lambda_6 L_\nu) \\ & + i\omega_5 \left(\frac{2}{f_\pi^2} \right) g_8 e \tilde{F}^{\mu\nu} \text{Tr}(Q U^\dagger L_\mu U) \text{Tr}(\lambda_6 L_\nu) \\ & + i\omega_6 \left(\frac{2}{f_\pi^2} \right) g_8 e \tilde{F}^{\mu\nu} \text{Tr} \left(\lambda_6 [U Q U^\dagger, L_\mu L_\nu] \right) \\ & + \omega_7 \left(\frac{2}{f_\pi^2} \right) g_8 e^2 F^{\mu\nu} F_{\mu\nu} \epsilon^{\alpha\beta\rho\sigma} \text{Tr}(\lambda_6 L_\alpha) \text{Tr}(L_\beta L_\rho L_\sigma),\end{aligned}\tag{3.2}$$

in which the ordinary derivative in L_μ is replaced by the covariant derivative in the presence of external gauge fields. Presently, there are only two information on the unknown parameters ω_i . First of all, Ecker, Pich and de Rafael (EPR)^[17] found the relation $\omega_2 = 4L_9$, which must hold at least for the divergent parts of the counterterm coupling constants because they must render the divergent loop amplitudes finite. Second, from the BNL measurement of the $K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ e^+ e^-$ decay rate,^[18] one finds a scale-independent relation

$$\omega_1 + 2\omega_2 - 12L_9 \simeq -7.5 \times 10^{-3}.\tag{3.3}$$

This together with the empirical value of $L_9^r(\mu = m_\rho) = 6.7 \times 10^{-3}$ leads to

$$\omega_1^r(\mu = m_\rho) + 2\omega_2^r(\mu = m_\rho) \simeq 0.074.\tag{3.4}$$

In the presence of the external electromagnetic field, the gauge field in Eq.(2.3) is identified with

$$A_\mu^L = -ieA_\mu Q, \quad A_\mu^R = -ieA_\mu Q,\tag{3.5}$$

with $Q = \text{diag}(2/3, -1/3, -1/3)$ and A_μ being the photon field. Just as in Sec.II, one first finds out the bosonization of the quark current in the presence of external photon field

[‡] Note that our ω_3 , ω_4 are the couplings ω_4 , ω_3 respectively in ref.[17]. The last three terms in (3.2) are missed in the same reference.

and then substitutes it into the four-quark operator ($Q_2 - Q_1$) and gets the non-anomalous $\Delta S = 1$ Lagrangian $\mathcal{L}_{\text{non-anom}}^{\Delta S=1}$ [Eq.(3.1)] with[§]

$$\omega_1 = \omega_2 = \frac{N_c}{12\pi^2}, \quad \omega_3 = 0. \quad (3.6)$$

The previous observation of $\omega_2 = 4L_9$ made by EPR is reproduced here. Evidently, the large- N_c prediction of $\omega_1 + 2\omega_2 = 0.076$ is remarkably in agreement with (3.4).[¶]

The derivation of the large- N_c anomalous weak chiral Lagrangian coupled to external photon fields is more complicated but more interesting as it is governed by chiral anomalies. To do this, one first writes down the relevant Wess-Zumino-Witten terms

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_{\text{wzw}} = & -\frac{N_c}{48\pi^2} \epsilon^{\mu\nu\rho\sigma} \text{Tr} \{ - (A_\mu^R R_\nu R_\rho R_\sigma + A_\mu^L L_\nu L_\rho L_\sigma) \\ & - \frac{1}{2} A_\mu^L L_\nu A_\rho^L L_\sigma - A_\mu^R U^\dagger A_\nu^L U R_\rho R_\sigma + A_\mu^L U A_\nu^R U^\dagger L_\rho L_\sigma \\ & + \partial_\mu A_\nu^R U^\dagger A_\rho^L U R_\sigma + \partial_\mu A_\nu^L U A_\rho^R U^\dagger L_\sigma \\ & + (A_\mu^L \partial_\nu A_\rho^L + \partial_\mu A_\nu^L A_\rho^L) L_\sigma \} + \dots, \end{aligned} \quad (3.7)$$

where $R_\mu \equiv U^\dagger \partial_\mu U$. Once the bosonization in the anomalous case is found after a lengthy manipulation, it is straightforward to show that^{*}

$$\omega_4 = 2\omega_5 = 4\omega_6 = -8\omega_7 = \frac{N_c}{12\pi^2}. \quad (3.8)$$

This result first obtained in ref.[9] was recently confirmed by ref.[21]. It should be stressed that the anomalous chiral coupling constants are free of gluonic corrections.

4. Application to $K \rightarrow 3\pi$ Decay

[§] Recently, very different large- N_c predictions $\omega_1 = \omega_2 = 8L_9$, $\omega_3 = 12L_{10}$ were obtained by Bruno and Prades.^[19] This is attributed to the fact that the effect of the quark operator Q_1 is not considered by them.

[¶] The large- N_c prediction $\omega_1 + 2\omega_2 - 12L_9 = 0$ is also in good agreement with (3.3) in view of the fact that $12L_9^r(\mu = m_\rho) \simeq 0.08$.

^{*} It was wrongly conjectured in ref.[20] that the couplings $\omega_4, \dots, \omega_7$ have nothing to do with the chiral anomaly. This has been corrected in ref.[21] and is now consistent with ref.[9].

As stressed in Introduction, it is necessary to introduce a weak chiral Lagrangian with higher derivatives in order to account for non-vanishing quadratic coefficients and the discrepancy between theory and experiment for the constant and linear terms in the Dalitz expansion of $K \rightarrow 3\pi$ amplitude [Eq.(1.1)]. For $\Delta I = \frac{1}{2}$ amplitudes, we find a remarkable agreement between $1/N_c$ theory and experiment within 3% for the constant and linear terms. (The reader is referred to ref.[8] for more details.) This means that very little room is left for chiral-loop corrections. The predicted coefficient c is just marginally in accord with data within the experimental errors, while the other coefficient d is off by three standard deviations. Clearly more accurate $K3\pi$ data are urgent to clarify this discrepancy. In the $\Delta I = \frac{3}{2}$ sector, we see that the linear term is generally in agreement with data, whereas the constant term is four standard deviations off from experiment. Obviously, more high-statistics experiments are required to improve the determination of $\Delta I = \frac{3}{2}$ coefficients a and b , and to extract the quadratic terms c and d in order to test the chiral-Lagrangian approach.

Since the quadratic slope parameter in the $K_L \rightarrow 3\pi^0$ Dalitz plot was recently measured at Fermilab based on a sample of 5.1×10^6 decays,^[22] it is very interesting to compare the $1/N_c$ prediction with experiment. The isospin structure of the $K_L \rightarrow 3\pi^0$ Dalitz amplitude is given by

$$A(K_L \rightarrow 3\pi^0) = -3(a_1 - 2a_3) - 3(c_1 - 2c_3)(Y^2 + X^2/3), \quad (4.1)$$

where the subscript 1 (3) refers to $\Delta I = \frac{1}{2}$ ($\frac{3}{2}$) transition. The quadratic slope parameter h for the decay is $2(c_1 - 2c_3)/(a_1 - 2a_3)$. From Tables 1 and 2 of ref.[8] we find

$$h = -4.7 \times 10^{-3}, \quad (4.2)$$

in accord with the result from the Fermilab E731 experiment

$$h_{\text{expt}} = -(3.3 \pm 1.1 \pm 0.7) \times 10^{-3}. \quad (4.3)$$

For comparison, a somewhat large value of $-(1.2 \pm 0.4) \times 10^{-2}$ for h is predicted by ref.[2].

Finally, we would also like to mention the decay $K_S \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-\pi^0$, whose Dalitz amplitude

is of the form $X(1 + \alpha Y)$. Explicitly,^[8]

$$A(K_S \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^- \pi^0) = -\frac{2}{3}b'_3 X + \frac{4}{3}d'_3 XY. \quad (4.4)$$

We predict that^[8]

$$Br(K_S \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^- \pi^0) = 3.9 \times 10^{-7}, \quad \alpha = 4.4 \times 10^{-2}. \quad (4.5)$$

The experimental feasibility for measuring this decay mode is not pessimistic.

5. Applications to Radiative Kaon Decay

5.1 The $K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ \gamma \gamma$ decay

As first pointed out by EPR,^[17] the loop amplitudes of $K_{L,S} \rightarrow \pi \gamma \gamma$ and $K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ \gamma \gamma$ are finite. From the point of view of large N_c chiral-Lagrangian approach, the mode $K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ \gamma \gamma$ is more interesting since it also receives contributions from the tree Lagrangians $\mathcal{L}_{\text{non-anom}}^{\Delta S=1}$ and $\mathcal{L}_S^{(4)}$ via pole diagrams (except for the ω_3 term which contributes via the direct-emission diagram). The total decay rate of $K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ \gamma \gamma$ was calculated in ref.[17] to be

$$\Gamma(K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ \gamma \gamma) = \Gamma_{\text{loop}} + \Gamma_{\text{tree}} + \Gamma_{\text{int}} + \Gamma_{\text{wzw}}, \quad (5.1)$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma_{\text{loop}} &= 2.80 \times 10^{-23} \text{GeV}, \quad \Gamma_{\text{tree}} = 0.17 \hat{c}^2 \times 10^{-23} \text{GeV}, \\ \Gamma_{\text{int}} &= 0.87 \hat{c} \times 10^{-23} \text{GeV}, \quad \Gamma_{\text{wzw}} = 0.26 \times 10^{-23} \text{GeV}, \end{aligned} \quad (5.2)$$

and

$$\hat{c} = 32\pi^2 [4(L_9 + L_{10}) - \frac{1}{3}(\omega_1 + 2\omega_2 + 2\omega_3)]. \quad (5.3)$$

Note that the combinations $\omega_1 + 2\omega_2 + 2\omega_3$ and $L_9 + L_{10}$ are separately scale independent. From Eqs.(2.4) and (3.6) we obtain $\hat{c} = -4$ and the branching ratio

$$Br(K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ \gamma \gamma) = 5.1 \times 10^{-7}. \quad (5.4)$$

Since this decay is dominated by chiral-loop effects, its decay rate is rather insensitive to the model of higher-derivative chiral Lagrangians. For example, $\hat{c}$ is predicted to be zero in

the so-called “weak deformation model”,^[23] but the corresponding branching ratio 5.8×10^{-7} is very close to that in the $1/N_c$ approach. In order to discriminate these two models, experimentally it is important to measure the two-photon spectrum around $z = m_{\gamma\gamma}^2/m_K^2 = 0.3$ where the spectrum behaves quite differently for $\hat{c} = -4$ and 0 (see Fig.2 of ref.[9]).

The present best upper limit^[24] 1.0×10^{-6} for $K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ \gamma\gamma$ was obtained by assuming a π^+ energy distribution given by phase space. If the theoretical spectrum for $\hat{c} = -4$ is used, then the upper limit will be pulled back to the level of 1.5×10^{-4} .^[24]

5.2 Direct $K \rightarrow \pi\pi\gamma$ transitions

The structure-dependent photon-emission decay $K \rightarrow \pi\pi\gamma$ provides an excellent probe on the p^4 weak chiral Lagrangian coupled to external electromagnetic fields. Under Lorentz and gauge invariance, the general expression for the invariant direct emission (DE) amplitude of the decay $K(k) \rightarrow \pi(p_1)\pi(p_2)\gamma(q)$ reads

$$A_{\text{DE}} = \tilde{\beta}M + \tilde{\gamma}E, \quad (5.5)$$

$$M \equiv e\epsilon_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma}p_1^\mu p_2^\nu q^\rho \epsilon^\sigma, \quad E \equiv e[(p_1 \cdot \epsilon)(p_2 \cdot q) - (p_2 \cdot \epsilon)(p_1 \cdot q)],$$

where ϵ_μ is the polarization vector of the photon. The first term of A_{DE} corresponds to magnetic transitions whereas the second term is caused by electric transitions. Evidently, the DE amplitude is of third power in momenta. Taking into account the experimental cutoff on the photon energy, we have the following branching ratios

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Br}(K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^0 \gamma)_{\text{DE}} &= 1.32 \times 10^5 \text{GeV}^6 (|\tilde{\beta}|^2 + |\tilde{\gamma}|^2), \\ \text{Br}(K_L \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^- \gamma)_{\text{DE}} &= 1.33 \times 10^6 \text{GeV}^6 (|\tilde{\beta}|^2 + |\tilde{\gamma}|^2), \\ \text{Br}(K_S \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^- \gamma)_{\text{DE}} &= 2.28 \times 10^3 \text{GeV}^6 (|\tilde{\beta}|^2 + |\tilde{\gamma}|^2). \end{aligned} \quad (5.6)$$

There are two contributions to direct photon emission of $K \rightarrow \pi\pi\gamma$: long-distance pole contributions and contact-term ones (i.e., direct weak transitions). The long-distance pole contribution is governed by the anomalous Wess-Zumino-Witten interaction. Note that in the limit of CP symmetry, $K_L \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^- \gamma$ proceeds only via the magnetic transition, whereas $K_S \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^- \gamma$ is caused by electric transition. At first sight, one may tempt to conclude that the theoretical prediction for $K_L \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^- \gamma$ should be most reliable because it is entirely determined by chiral anomalies. We will see later that it is not the case.

Numerical values of the $1/N_c$ predictions are shown in Table I of ref.[9]. It is evident from Table I that the agreement between theory and experiment for the direct emission of $K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^0\gamma$ is striking, implying that very little room is left for chiral-loop corrections. For $K_S \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-\gamma$, the branching ratio of the structure-dependent component is predicted to be 2×10^{-7} , which is beyond the present upper limit^[25] 6×10^{-5} .

We cannot make a definite prediction for the direct emission of $K_L \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-\gamma$ owing to a large theoretical uncertainty in the estimate of the long-distance effect, as we shall discuss shortly. In the absence of the η' pole, it is easily seen that the pole contribution to $K_L \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-\gamma$ vanishes due to the Gell-Mann-Okubo mass relation $m_\eta^2 = \frac{1}{3}(4m_K^2 - m_\pi^2)$. However, the direct weak contribution alone will yield a branching ratio of 2×10^{-4} , which is too large by an order of magnitude when compared with experimental branching fraction^[26] of $(2.89 \pm 0.28) \times 10^{-5}$. This means that a large *destructive* interference between pole and direct-transition amplitudes of $K_L \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-\gamma$ is required in order to explain data. The η' pole is thus called for.

The inclusion of the η' intermediate state introduces two complications: First, the $SU(3)$ singlet η_0 is outside of the framework of $SU(3) \times SU(3)$ ChPT; that is, the matrix element $\langle \eta_0 | \mathcal{L}_W | K_L \rangle$ is not related to the $K_L - \pi^0$ transition by $SU(3)$ symmetry. Second, there will be an $\eta - \eta'$ mixing effect. In the $U(3) \times U(3)$ version of $\mathcal{L}_W$, the above-mentioned two matrix elements are connected via nonet symmetry, viz.

$$\langle \eta_0 | \mathcal{L}_W | K_L \rangle = -2\sqrt{\frac{2}{3}}\rho \langle \pi^0 | \mathcal{L}_W | K_L \rangle, \quad (5.7)$$

where the parameter ρ is introduced so that the deviation of ρ from unity implies the breakdown of nonet symmetry. The pole contribution is quite sensitive to $SU(3)$ symmetry and nonet symmetry breaking. For example, in the absence of symmetry breaking effects the branching ratio is calculated to be 6.4×10^{-5} , which is two times large. Neglecting $SU(3)$ breaking and fitting to the experimental central value, we find $\rho \approx 1.1$. This illustrates that presently no definite prediction on the pole effects can be made with certainty.^{*}

Finally, two remarks are in order. (i) Pole and contact-term contributions are equally important for the direct radiative transition of K^+ and K_L , whereas only the latter one

^{*} Efforts of relating the pole contributions of $K_L \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-\gamma$ and $K_L \rightarrow \gamma\gamma$ have been made before (see e.g., refs.[9, 20,27]). However, as emphasized by Shore and Veneziano,^[28] the naive PCAC analysis does not apply to the decay $\eta' \rightarrow \gamma\gamma$.

contributes to $K_S \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-\gamma$ in the limit of CP symmetry. (ii) Unlike inner bremsstrahlung, the direct-emission amplitudes of $K^\pm \rightarrow \pi^\pm\pi^0\gamma$ and $K_L \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-\gamma$ are no longer subject to the $\Delta I = \frac{1}{2}$ rule and CP violation, respectively. This explains why the branching ratio of K^+ and K_L is larger than that of K_S by two orders of magnitude and why structure-dependent effects can be seen in those two decay modes.

6. Conclusion

We have applied the large N_c chiral Lagrangian approach to nonleptonic and radiative kaon decays. Decay rates and spectra are unambiguously predictable to the leading $1/N_c$ expansion and to the zeroth order in gluonic modifications. Future high-statistics experiments with great sensitivity will be able to test those predictions.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author wishes to thank Profs. K. Goeke and W-Y. Pauchy Hwang for inviting him to participate in this Symposium. This work was supported in part by the National Science Council of the Republic of China.

REFERENCES

1. J. Gasser and H. Leutwyler, *Nucl. Phys.* **B250** (1985) 465.
2. J. Kambor, J.F. Donoghue, B.R. Holstein, J. Missimer, and D. Wyler, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **68**(1992), 1818.
3. J. Balog, *Phys. Lett.* **B149** (1984) 197; *Nucl. Phys.* **B258** (1985) 361; K. Seo, Gifu preprint GWJC-1, 1984 (unpublished); A.A. Andrianov, *Phys. Lett.* **157B**(1985), 425.
4. R. MacKenzie, F. Wilczek, and A. Zee, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **53**(1984), 2203; I.J.R. Aitchison and C.M. Fraser, *Phys. Lett.* **146B**(1984), 63; G. Bhattacharya and S. Rajeev, in *Proceedings of the Sixth Annual Montreal-Rochester-Syracuse-Toronto Meeting, Syracuse, 1984* (Syracuse University, Syracuse, New York, 1984); L.-H. Chan, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **55**(1985), 21; P. Simić, *ibid.* **55**(1985), 40; A. Zaks, *Nucl. Phys.* **B260**(1985), 241; C. Fraser, *Z. Phys.* **C28**(1985), 101.
5. D. Espriu, R. de Rafael, and J. Taron, *Nucl. Phys.* **B345**(1990), 22.
6. D. Ebert and H. Reinhardt, *Nucl. Phys.* **B271**(1986), 188; for a recent similar derivation of the low-energy action of the Nambu-Jona-Lasinio model, see J. Bijnens, C. Bruno, and E. de Rafael, CERN-TH-6521/92.
7. H.Y. Cheng, *Phys. Rev.* **D42**(1990), 3850.
8. H.Y. Cheng, *Phys. Lett.* **B238**(1990), 399.
9. H.Y. Cheng, *Phys. Rev.* **D42**(1990), 72.
10. J.A. Cronin, *Phys. Rev.* **101**(1967), 1483.
11. Particle Data Group, *Phys. Rev.* **D45**(1992), S1.
12. Yu. M. Antipov *et al.*, *Z. Phys.* **C26**(1985), 495; *Phys. Lett.* **121B** (1983) 445.
13. G. Ecker, J. Gasser, A. Pich, and E. de Rafael, *Nucl. Phys.* **B321**(1989), 311.
14. E. Golowich, *Phys. Rev.* **D35**(1987), 2764; *ibid.* **D36** (1987) 3516.
15. J. Kambor, J. Missimer, and D. Wyler, *Nucl. Phys.* **B346**(1990), 17.
16. W.A. Bardeen, A.J. Buras, J.-M. Gérard, *Phys. Lett.* **192B**(1987), 138; *Nucl. Phys.* **B293** (1987) 787; S. Fajfer and J.-M. Gérard, *Z. Phys.* **C42**(1989), 425.

17. G. Ecker, A. Pich and E. de Rafael, *Nucl. Phys.* **B291** (1987) 692; *Phys. Lett.* **B189** (1987) 363; *Nucl. Phys.* **B303** (1988) 665.
18. C. Alliegro *et al.*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **68**(1992), 278.
19. C. Bruno and J. Prades, CPT-92/P.2795 (1992).
20. G. Ecker, H. Neufeld, and A. Pich, *Phys. Lett.* **B278**(1992), 337.
21. J. Bijnens, G. Ecker, and A. Pich, *Phys. Lett.* **B286**(1992), 341.
22. S.V. Somalwar *et al.*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **68**(1992), 2580.
23. G. Ecker, A. Pich, and E. de Rafael, *Phys. Lett.* **B237**(1990), 481.
24. M.S. Atiya *et al.*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **65**(1990), 1188.
25. Experiments for $K_S \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-\gamma$: H. Taureg *et al.*, *Phys. Lett.* **65B**(1976), 92; G. Burgun *et al.*, *Phys. Lett.* **46B**(1973), 481.
26. Experiment for $K_L \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-\gamma$: A.S. Carroll *et al.*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **44**(1980), 529.
27. H.Y. Cheng, *Phys. Lett.* **B245**(1990), 122.
28. G.M. Shore and G. Veneziano, *Nucl. Phys.* **B381**(1992), 3.